## REMARKS

Claims 1-45 were pending. Claims 1, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 37, 44, and 45 have been amended to clarify the nature of the invention. Support for these amendments may be found in the Specification in at least figures 8 and 9 and page 16, lines 17-26. Accordingly, claims 1-45 remain pending subsequent entry of the present amendment.

Applicant notes and appreciates the withdrawal of the prior rejections. In the present Office Action, claims 1-11, 14-29, 32-42, and 44-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over newly cited Reed et al, (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,325, hereinafter "Reed") in view of Perlman (U.S. Patent No. 5,455,865 hereinafter "Perlman"). Applicant has reviewed the references and believes the pending claims recite a combination of features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections and requests reconsideration.

Applicant submits claim 1 recites features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, either singly or in combination. As amended, claim 1 recites:

> "A method for routing messages comprising:
> receiving a message from a sender;
> converting the message into an internal format, wherein said converting comprises **adding at least an attribute part to a data part of the message**;
> writing into said attribute part data extracted from said received message and data indicative of a protocol by which the message was received; and
> routing said converted message in dependence on the data in said attribute part."

In paragraph 2 of the present Office Action, it is stated that "Reed discloses: converting a message received from a sender into an internal format comprising at least

an attribute part and a data part, Col. 32, lines 63-67, Col. 33, lines 1-35." However, Applicant submits at least the above highlighted features are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. In contrast to the presently claimed invention, Reed merely discloses that reception includes decoding the object's transmission protocol prior to storing the object in the receiver's database. For example, Reed discloses:

> "the transfer to the consumer program 22 principally results in the execution of a set of processing steps. These steps typically include decoding of the MIME object, reading of the object, and storage of the object in the consumer database 21. " (Reed, col. 27, lines 14-18).

Regarding formats, Reed discloses that the format in which the object is stored in the receiver's database is the same as the format in which the object is stored in the transmitter's database. More specifically, Reed discloses:

> "As discussed above, the provider computer 1 includes a provider database 11 operated on by provider program 12, and the consumer computer 2 includes a consumer database 21 operated on by consumer program 22. However, since "provider" and "consumer" are merely functional distinctions, in a preferred embodiment, a single computer and computer program would be able to operate as a provider computer 1 in executing instructions of the provider program 12 and as a consumer computer 2 in executing instructions of the consumer program 22. In this instance, only a single database may be used, if desired, to hold all of the data for transmitted objects and for received objects. The database structures described below could apply to a single database, or to separate databases if the programs operated separately.
>
> FIG 3 uses a standard object-oriented notational format to illustrate an embodiment of object classes in a single database 100 of the present invention" (Reed, col. 16, line 55 – col. 17, line 7).

As may be seen from the above, Reed discloses that the database structures (objects) could apply to a single database, or to separate databases if the programs operated separately, i.e. as a provider and a consumer. Therefore, the structures of the consumer database are the same as the structures of the provider database. If the structures are the same, then an object in the consumer database includes the same parts as it had when it was stored in the provider database. Thus, Applicant submits that Reed

does not disclose adding any parts to the object. Accordingly, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in Reed of "converting the message into an internal format, wherein said converting comprises adding at least an attribute part to a data part of the message" as is recited in amended claim 1. Further, neither does Perlman teach or suggest the above features. Rather, Perlman merely describes routing of packets that conform to one particular protocol, the format of which is illustrated in figures 3a, 4a, 6a, 6b, and 8a. For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art, either singly or in combination. Further, because claims 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 37, 44, and 45 include similar features to that of claim 1, claims 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 37, 44, and 45 are patentable over the cited art for similar reasons. Likewise, as each of dependent claims 2-14, 20-36, and 38-43 includes at least the features of the above independent claims upon which it depends, each of dependent claims 2-14, 20-36, and 38-43 is believed patentable as well.

In addition to the above, claims 12, 13, 30, 31, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed and Perlman as applied to claims 1-11, 14-29, 32-42, and 44-45 above and further in view of Ginter et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,658,568. Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections and requests reconsideration.

Applicant submits claims 12 and 13 recite features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, either singly or in combination. For example, claim 12 recites

> "The method of claim 1, further comprising:
> determining whether there exists a transaction identifier associated with the received message, the message corresponding to a transaction; and
> generating a transaction identifier for the message in response to determining no transaction identifier associated with the message exists."

On page 10, fourth paragraph of the present Office Action, it is suggested "As per claims 13 and 31: Reed and Perlman disclose the claimed invention except for allocating a new transaction identifier if no transaction identifier is detected in the received

message. Ginter teaches that it is known in the art to provide allocating a new transaction identifier if no transaction identifier is detected in the received message. Col. 95, lines 1-67."

It is first noted that the limitation of "generating a transaction identifier for the message in response to determining no transaction identifier associated with the message exists" is first recited in claim 12, not claim 13. The Examiner has not directed comments to the features of claim 13 that distinguish it from claim 12. In any event, Applicant submits the cited art neither teaches nor suggests all of the features of claim 12. In contrast to the presently claimed invention, Ginter generally discloses a transaction authority for auditing transactions via control sets. For example, Ginter discloses:

> "FIGS. 58A and 58B show example steps and processes performed by transaction authority 700 to perform an "atomic transaction". ...
>
> In this example, each value chain participant 164(1), . . . 164(N) in a process administered by transaction authority 700 could contribute a control set 188(1), . . . 188(N) specifying or governing the participant's own business requirements, limitations and processes for the transaction (FIGS. 58A and 58B, block 750). These individual control sets 188(1), 188(N) specify how each individual participant performs its own role. ...
>
> Transaction authority 700 also receives another control set 188X specifying how to link the various participants' control sets together into overall transaction processes with requirements and limitations (FIGS. 58A and 58B, block 752). This overall transaction control set 188Y specifies how to resolve conflicts between the sub-transaction control sets 188(1), 188(N) provided by the individual participants (this could involve, for example, an electronic negotiation process 798 as shown in FIGS. 75A-76A of the Ginter et al. patent disclosure). The transaction authority 700 combines the participant's individual control sets--tying them together with additional logic to create an overall transaction control superset 188Y (FIGS. 58A and 58B, block 752). ...
>
> Upon receipt of an incoming event requiring processing (FIG. 58B, block 756), transaction authority 700 may activate the overall transaction control superset 188Y (FIG. 58B, block 758). The transaction authority 700 may then deliver corresponding reciprocal control sets corresponding to portions of the overall transaction control superset 188Y to each

participant in the transaction--thereby enabling each participant to communicate with the superset (FIG. 58B, block 760)." (Ginter, Col. 95, lines 7-55).

As may be seen from the above, Ginter discloses that upon receipt of an incoming event requiring processing, transaction authority 700 may activate the overall transaction control superset. However, Ginter is silent as to how the transaction authority identifies a message with a transaction. In contrast, the claimed method includes determining whether there exists a transaction identifier associated with the received message and generating a transaction identifier for the message in response to determining no transaction identifier associated with the message exists. It is clear from the above recitation that some messages may have a transaction identifier and other messages may not have a transaction identifier. Applicant has read the cited portions as well as the remainder of Ginter and finds no corresponding teaching or suggestion of messages with and without transaction identifiers. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Ginter also does not disclose "generating a transaction identifier for the message in response to determining no transaction identifier associated with the message exists" as is recited in claim 12. Nor are these features disclosed by Reed or Perlman.

In addition, claim 13 recites

"The method of claim 12, further comprising:
utilizing a transaction identifier associated with the message to determine whether there exists a previously stored context which indicates a state of the transaction; and
creating a context associated with the message in response to determining no context exists for the message."

Applicant submits the cited art neither teaches nor suggests all of the features of claim 13. The claimed method includes determining whether there exists a previously stored context which indicates a state of the transaction and creating a context associated with the message in response to determining no context exists for the message. It is clear from the above that some messages have a previously stored context which indicates a state of the transaction and other messages do not. Applicant finds no corresponding

disclosure in Ginter of messages with and without a context which indicates a state of the transaction. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Ginter also does not disclose "creating a context associated with the message in response to determining no context exists for the message" as is recited in claim 13. Nor are these features disclosed by Reed or Perlman.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 12 and 13 are patentably distinguished from the cited art, taken either singly or in combination. Further, because claims 30 and 31 include similar features to that of claims 12 and 13, claims 30 and 31 are patentable over the cited art for similar reasons. Likewise, as each of claims 14 and 32 includes at least the features of the above claims upon which it depends, each of claims 14 and 32 is believed patentable as well.

In view of the above comments, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections. Should the examiner believe there remain issues which would prevent the present application from proceeding to allowance, a telephone interview is requested by the below signed representative, at (512) 853-8866, in order to facilitate a resolution.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-77301/RDR.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,

Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: April 12, 2006